



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

8/21

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,023	07/23/2003	Larry C. Hardin	WOG 1387.0025	8216
7590	10/12/2004		EXAMINER	
William O. Geny, Esq. 1600 ODS Tower 601 SW Second Avenue Portland, OR 97204-3157			WOOD, KIMBERLY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3632	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,023	HARDIN, LARRY C.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kimberly T. Wood	3632		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

This is an office action for serial number 10/625,023, entitled Stable Tripod For Telescope, filed July 23, 2003.

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species I drawn to figures 1-6 and 8

Species II drawn to figures 7.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 4, and 14 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant

must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with William Geny on September 21, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Species I, claims 1-15. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 16-18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the drawings should include a figure representing the tripod in the collapsed/closed state. The examiner finds it difficult to understand how the tripod would collapse since the struts (44), legs (16), and

support links (50) do not telescope therefore a detailed drawing in the collapsed state would clarify how the tripod functions.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the three connector links (claim 13) has not been disclosed in the specification. The applicant has disclosed three cylinders 72a-c) as being the connection for the legs respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weber et al. (Weber) 4,199,123). Weber discloses a tripod stand having a platform base (18), selectively adjustable three foot members (52, 58, 54, and 56), and three sets of interconnected triangular support structures, (legs (14 and 16), stabilizer link (28), and vertical struts (near 24)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 10-13 as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber 4,199,123, as disclosed above in view of Dalton 2,668,682 in further view of Apple 1,757,106. Weber discloses a platform (18), three legs (14, and 16), three support link assemblies (near 24), three sets of stabilizer links (28), and three foot members (56), three connector links (26). Weber discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the legs being a pair of rods, three casters and stabilizer members. Dalton teaches that it is known to have a platform base (above 16), three connector links (16), three foot members (17), a set of stabilizer links (18), three links comprising a pair of rods. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the legs to have the pair or rods with the

Art Unit: 3632

three link connector as taught by Dalton for the purpose of reducing the weight of the tripod therefore making it easier to transport. Apple teaches that it is known to have a casters (9) having a stabilizer member (17) being a threaded bolt (14) received in a threaded bore of the foot for engaging the ground (figure 1, near 12-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Weber in view of Dalton to have included the wheel and stabilizer as taught by Apple for the purpose of transporting the tripod to various locations and once desired location has been reached preventing the wheels from moving therefore stabilizing the tripod.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber 4,199,123, as disclosed above in view of Dalton 2,668,682 in further view of Apple 1,757,106 and in further view of Paepke 270,605. Weber in view of Dalton and Apple disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the foot having a pair of wheels. Paepke teaches that it is known to provide multiple wheels to casters (figures 1-5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Weber in view of Dalton and Apple to have included the additional wheel to each caster as taught by Paepke for facilitating transport.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art discloses conventional tripods and/or feet with stabilizer members.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly T. Wood whose telephone number is 703-308-0539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leslie Braun can be reached on 703-308-2156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kimberly T. Wood
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3632

September 27, 2004